1: Fedotov S-4 (no date) 1954 RF1 Great Russia RF1

his own peculiar quiet wisdom, produces one of the finest human types. How we long for it in our warped life, swayed as we are by all kinds of passions—and be it spiritual passions! But the Russian can be cruel too—this we know well by now—and not only in a brief flare-up of fury but in a smugly callous, ruthlessly selfish way. Most often he amazes us by a kind of Oriental indifference to the lot and the sufferings of others—coupled with gentleness and superficial compassion (Karataev!). There is something Chinese in the impassive attitude of the Russian peasant towards his own and his fellowmen's death. This kind of wisdom takes us beyond the limits of Christianity. Tolstoy was profoundly aware of the primeval, prehistoric roots of this indifference ("The Three Deaths").

Nor is it easy to generalize about the volitional nature of the Russian. Is he indolent or active? More often than not he appears lazy; he works under pressure, pulling himself together only at the very last; but then he does not spare himself and is capable of making up in a few days for months of idleness. But there are also Russians of dogged industry, performing their tasks with restrained but intense passion; such were to be found among kulaks, inventors, scientists, even administrators. The amorphous mass of the people readily submits to the leadership of this sturdy élite, while seldom respecting it. Without this ruthless and strong-willed type the creation of the Empire, and even of the Muscovite state, would have been unthinkable.

In mentioning the Muscovite state, we are offering a clue to the understanding of this second brand of Russian. Its embodiment is the Muscovite, as his hard historical destinies have shaped him. For two or three centuries rough hands had been at work kneading the Slavic dough, knocking, bruising, breaking in the recalcitrant stuff, molding it into an extremely tenacious form. The Petrine Empire overlaid the Muscovite tsardom with a varnish of European culture, but it was still the Muscovite type that remained the real mainstay. To this type belong all those classes that were little touched by the Petersburg culture. All the clergy, the merchant class, the thrifty part of the peasantry (insofar as it was not undermined by spiritual restlessness). We meet this type again in the great Russian literature, where it is, however, pushed into the background by later spiritual formations. It is reflected most vividly in the regional literature—the writings of Aksakov, Leskov, Melnikov, Mamin-Sibiriak. And Tolstoy, of course. Although he cannot be fitted altogether into the Muscovite mold, he stemmed from it, had a

1: Fedotov S-4 (no date) 1954 RF1 Great Russia RF1

deep fondness for this type, and was apt to idealize it. Karataev, Kutuzov, Levin are Muscovites; and so are Captain Mironov and Maxim Maximovich—Muscovite state servants who have survived the Petrine upheaval. The plodding official under Nicholas I, so ill-treated by the satirical literature of the time, represents the last layer of the Muscovite formation. We meet this type also on the highest cultural level: Pososhkov, Bolotov, the Aksakovs, Zabelin, Kliuchevsky—all these are authentic Muscovites. Here is the source of Russian creative power—which, however, like all things ultra-national, is rather limited in outlook. The narrow-mindedness of Tolstoy and Mussorgsky can assume truly tragical forms.

Such are the two polar types of Russianness, to whose conflict the high drama of the nineteenth century is largely due. They may be regarded as the expression of the basic dualism inherent in the Russian soul. They are, however, only the latest historically conditioned manifestations of this duality. Of all the successive cultural layers of the Russian soul, they represent the Muscovite stratum and that latest formation, the intelligentsia, born in the eighteen-thirties. But the historical approach to the problem of the Russian character makes it imperative to look beyond the limits of this duality. Between Muscovy and the intelligentsia there lies the Empire. Nor did Russia begin with Muscovy. What remains today of the Russian of the Empire, the Russian of the Kievan era, of Novgorod?

When, basing our claim on Pushkin, we assert with Dostoevsky that the Russian is a universalist, and that in this lies his national mission, it is actually the imperial Russian we have in mind. Universality is characteristic neither of the Muscovite nor of a true representative of the intelligentsia. On the contrary, the distinctive feature of both is narrow-mindedness, sectarianism. The Petrine reform, however, had brought Russia out into the open spaces of the world, had placed her at the crossroads of all the great Western civilizations and had brought into being the species of the Russian-European. His main attribute is freedom and openness of mind—such as to set him apart not only from the Muscovite but also from the European of the West. European culture, taken as a whole, was more intensely alive on the banks of the Neva or Moskva than on those of the Seine, the Thames, or the Spree. It is this imperial upper-class stratum that has given rise to the myth of the Russian's peculiar gift for foreign languages. Actually the average Russian,

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RFI Great Russia RFI

were directed not only against this cult, but also against that of the Fire and of the Sun.[25] There was no cult of war-gods in the mythology of the Old Slavs nor was there any epic poetry in their folklore.

Unlike the patriarchal, rigidly stratified and dualistic religious system of steppe nomads which was full of tensions and struggles, the supernatural world of the Slavs of Polesie was anarchic, equalitarian and peaceful. Apparently projecting their own social organization into the supernatural world, the Old-Slavonic plowmen conceived it as being composed of both sexes but without a hierarchy of power among themselves. The deities that inhabited that world were neither arbitrary nor corrupted, nor did they fight among themselves for the control over man. Festivals in their honor were celebrated with the accent on drink, song, dance and lovemaking.

Accordingly the Slavs of Polesie did not have to appease their deities nor try to be on good terms with both the bad and the good ones. They believed that after death bad and wicked people would roam the earth in the form of werewolves and vampires; but, they also possessed simple means of protection against these evil ghosts, such as pieces of torn clothes, which were accessible to everyone.[26] There were always persons of both sexes who maintained contact and control over the spirits of evil and were willing to help anyone in distress. Hence the Old Slavs trusted their wizards, the *veshchy*.[27]

According to the religious and social philosophy of the Slavs of the Dnieper, there are some general all-embracing rules of behavior to which all people, all the universe as well as all the deities, are subjected. In such a religious and philosophical system, the deities could not be capricious. They could be relied upon to behave according to commonly accepted rules of conduct and should not therefore be distrusted and feared. It is this optimistic view of destiny and of the universe, in which order and anarchic equity, not sword or might nor caprice prevail, that perhaps had found expression in the Old-Slavonic concept of law which was identified with truth and justice (*pravda*). The same view of life had perhaps found expression also in the Old-Slavonic concept of judgment which was identified with destiny

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

role of the women and children in his family and on complete subjection of all people under his control. To accept anything else would have been contrary to his view of life, to everything he stood for. It would have conflicted with his temper and his character to have acted differently. It might have meant not only loss of face but loss of power as well.

The invader was therefore likely to maintain his social distance, to resort to physical force and violence, to the *knut*,[8] to impose his dominance on and to expect unconditional obedience from all the members of his household as well as from all others who were settled and worked on the land which he had conquered and which he controlled. He was backed in such attitudes and practices by the traditional philosophy of the steppe warriors which tells them that might is right and that only unchallenged power imposed by means of fear and awe brings personal satisfaction and security.

Such conflicting marital and social philosophies, however, provoked intense social conflicts, witnessed, for instance, by the history of Slav-Avar relations. The oppressed Slavonic concubines and wives, together with their children, tended to revolt against their tyrannical and inscrutable Avar husbands and fathers:

> The Chunen [Avars] came every year to the Slavs to spend the winter among them, and abuse the wives and daughters of the Slavs. . . . But the sons of the Chunen men and the wives and maidens of the Wenden [Slavs] did not tolerate this oppression; they refused to obey the Chunen and started an uprising.[9]

Such resolute and fighting women have been perhaps personified in Russian epic narratives by Polenitsi (steppe women), the female warriors. The physical strength of these Russian Amazons is represented as being greater than that of the Bogatyri, the legendary heroes. Polenitsi are pictured as daring, bold women, who fight, torture, maim and kill the Bogatyri. But they also invite these heroes to sleep with them and resort to various tricks or to sheer force to coerce the Bogatyri to take them in marriage.

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

These feuds did not affect only the relations between local lords; intense strifes and vendettas were flourishing within the family of each one of the princes. Struggle for power and expansion often caused fratricidal warfare among the brothers after the death of their father. The old chronicles and other historical documents are full of examples of such family feuds. Murder, torture and blinding among the brothers and even between fathers and sons apparently were frequent.[20] The life of each one of these local potentates was spent in perpetual warfare, in feuding, and in plundering adventures.[21]

Power-thirstiness, factionalism, and rule of crude force prevailed among these petty rulers in no lesser way than among their nomadic predecessors and overlords. The internal system of rule on the domains of each prince was not more advanced. As the Russian written laws of that period testify, the killing of prince's representatives on the part of the peasants must have been frequent. City populace often rose in riots and revolutionary outbursts against the oppressive conditions imposed by these lords.[22] It was such conditions of physical, social and emotional insecurity that favored perpetuation of the institutions, practices, and other behavior traits which were introduced by the nomadic invaders and conquerors.

III

The changes that in the course of several centuries were taking place in social and psychological structure of the Old-Slavonic world as a result of the imposition of the rule of the nomadic warriors seem to have been well reflected in the Great-Russian folklore, especially in its epic legends. The military, the peasants, the burghers, their conflicts and their character traits are personified in these narratives by a number of popular heroes.[23]

The general picture which these folk documents present shows that the social stability which existed in the Old-Slavonic society was completely shattered as a result of nomadic invasions and conquests. The invading warriors not only caused great havoc but they provoked rapid and fundamental changes in the structure of the old society. Moreover the social disorganization and the political and economic instability that resulted out of these

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

events were apparently manifested in a widespread sense of emotional and physical insecurity which fostered destructive aggression and mass violence. In such circumstances extreme self-seeking and dominance-submission relationships tended to substitute the Old-Slavonic egalitarian and anarchic system.

The plight of the Slavonic peasant strata has been symbolized in these products of folk imagination in the person of Mikula Selyaninovich ("the Villager's son") and in that of Ilya of Murom, who is often referred to as "the peasant's son," and as "the old Cossak." Mikula is pictured as a superb plowman and field laborer. He has a keen knowledge of husbandry and possesses the best mares and the best farming equipment.[24] He is endowed with such tremendous strength and is entrusted with such heavy responsibility that he carries "the weight of the whole world" in a little shoulder bag. This villager, however, comes into conflict with the city people over the custom duties and over the haughty manner of the urbanites. The tolls imposed by the city are too high. Moreover, the burghers treat Mikula in a despicable and undignified way. So he is enraged and loses his self-control:

> I was in the city no longer ago than the day before yesterday,
> On my light bay mare,
> I carried thence two whole bags of salt,
> Two bags of salt of forty pud each.
> The folk there are no better than robbers.
> They demand two kopecks toll;
> But I had a leaded whip for toll
> I paid their two kopecks toll.
> Whoever was upright I left seated
> And whoever was seated I left prostrate,
> And whoever lay prostrate would never rise again.[25]

As a result of such conflicts, Mikula finally came to the conclusion that tilling was not profitable any more. He found that there were other and better ways which would guarantee to one safety, economic gain, and self-respect. So he gave up husbandry and joined Volga Buslavlevich, the bandit-warrior. In his new role in which he uses great physical power not as a productive force, but as a means of coercion, he makes a strong imprint on

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

the mind of the burghers. As a result, the city folk changed their attitude and instead of haughty bearing they now "bow low" to Mikula.

Ilya of Murom, the other hero of peasant origin, is portrayed as "being crippled" for many years. Then suddenly he acquires gigantic strength from two sources: from psalm singers and from Svyatogor, a hero of supernatural origin and superhuman powers. By means of this acquired strength and by employing cunning, Ilya gets rid of Svyatogor and, like Mikula, joins the bandit-warriors. However, the professional warriors do not accept Ilya on equal terms because of his low origin. But by constant demonstration of superior physical strength employed as a means of intimidation Ilya is finally accepted by the ruling military aristocracy. After a terrifying demonstration of physical strength which shook the whole town to its foundation Prince Vladimir became so panicky that he hurried a messenger to humbly invite Ilya to a prince's feast:

> Knock upon the door five times
> Then cross yourself in the prescribed manner
> Make your bow as it is enjoined,
> Offer humble salutations, and beat with your forehead
> Upon the floor of bricks,
> Upon damp mother earth herself,
> Before the old Cossack, Ilya of Murom.[26]

It seems clear that in these two heroes of peasant origin we find reflected the vicissitudes to which the Old-Slavonic society has been exposed after it has been subjugated to warriors and traders. The moral and productive values of the peasants, symbolized by Mikula's strength, his skill in productiveness, his social responsibility and feelings of dignity and equality, were rapidly declining in the changing conditions. The peasants became an easy prey of the new ruling classes. The result was moral corruption on the part of the soil cultivators, disinterest in land, and an urge to revolt. The peasantry became "crippled." First they expected help from supernatural forces. Then finally they began to rely on guile and on terror to protect themselves. They realized that in the new political atmosphere it was superior physical force which was admired and respected. Many peasants

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

therefore were leaving the land to move to the cities or to join the bandits as traders and warriors.

These bandit-warriors are pictured in the Russian folk epic as ruling by such terrifying violence and dreadful terror and craft that all the living beings on the earth flee and hide, or lie prostrate, and even the earth itself shrinks and the sun sinks away at their appearance:

> The red sun was sinking
> Behind the dark woods, behind the broad sea,
> Multitudes of stars studded the clear sky
> When Lord Volga Buslavlevich was born
> In holy Russia.
> When Volga Buslavlevich was five years of age,[27]
> Lord Volga Buslavlevich went forth over the damp earth
> Damp mother earth was rent,
> The wild beasts fled away up to the clouds;
> And the fish scattered in the blue sea:
> And Lord Volga Buslavlevich went
> To learn all craft and wisdom,
> All the various languages;[28]
>
> Volga grew in strength and stature.
> He chose for himself a bold druzhina,
> Of thirty youths save one,
> He, Volga making the thirtieth.
> His dear 'uncle' bestowed upon him,
> Gracious Vladimir of Royal Kiev,
> Three cities with their peasants.[29]

The hero knights of these legendary *Byliny* (the events of the olden days) when they find themselves in circumstances which appear to be under their control, are likely to be boastful, quarrelsome, disrespectful, sensitive to rank and inclined to belittle the strength of their adversaries. In such circumstances they spend their time either in plundering, fighting, maiming and killing, or in feasting, debauchery, and drunkenness.[30]

The extreme power-compulsion and delusions of grandeur of these supermen, as well as their complete lack of self-control, are well symbolized in folk narratives about Svyatogor. This hero has an irresistible urge to bring the heaven and the earth to-

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

gether and to subdue the whole of the universe to his personal control. But he is at the same time utterly incapable of controlling his own gigantic strength. Hence he provokes the whole earth against himself ("Mother Earth could not bear his weight"):

He saddled his heroic steed
And rode forth on his way.
His young heart was throbbing,
His strength vibrated in his sinews,
His energy was like to overflow,
And he was heavily burdened with his strength,
Heavily burdened as with a grievous load;
He could not control his heroic strength.
And he threw away his steel club
Which vanished out of sight about the clouds,
And caught it again in his white hand;
"If I should take to walking on the earth
I would fasten a ring to heaven,
I would bind an iron chain to the ring,
I would drag the sky down to mother earth
I would turn the earth on its end,
And I would confound earth with heaven."[31]

There is no deed that these warriors and bandits would hesitate to commit in order to increase their personal power. The Great-Russian folk narratives agree with the early Russian chronicles and with later Russian historical documents that these men were ready to murder even their own closest kin in order to achieve their personal aims. In a folk epic this extreme bloodthirstiness and quest for power is symbolized by young Shchelkun, a hero of Tartar origin who murders his own son, and then, like the Scythians of old, drinks his blood. By this act of extreme cruelty he seeks his own self-aggrandizement:

Stab your son
Your beloved son,
Fill a bowl of his blood,
Drink up this blood,
This warm blood,
And then I will grant you

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

538
152
272

Tver the ancient,
Tver the wealthy,
And the two brothers,
The two bold Borisovichi.
At once young Schelkun
Stabbed his son,
Filled a bowl of his blood,
His warm blood,
And drank up the bowl of that warm blood;
And straightway Tsar Azvych
Bestowed upon him
Tver the ancient,
Tver the wealthy,
And the two brothers,
The two bold Borisovichi.[32]

However, as soon as such "Good bold youths who have robbed and slain" find themselves in circumstances which appear to be unsurmountable, they are inclined to become cowardly, are overwhelmed with gloom and fear, and tend to rely on crouching servility and on guile and cunning as a means of self-preservation. When in such a mood they picture their enemies as superhuman, beastly beings possessing supernatural strength, thus justifying the lack of fair play in dealing with them.

178
754

It is possible that this radical change of social structure was projected into the new folk concept of the supernatural world. The Old-Slavonic fairyland inhabited predominantly by benevolent spirits was apparently transformed under the new conditions into a demonland full of beings with terrifying and macabre qualities. Blood-sucking vampires, heart-devouring witches, fiends that feast on human flesh, and other murderous and rapacious beings similar to those found in the underworld of the steppe nomads replaced the Old-Slavonic helpful deities and moderately malignant spirits.

In the same manner the Old-Slavonic benevolent wizards apparently evolved into rapacious and slaughterous witches who specialize in child eating. The Old-Slavonic beautiful and benevolent water spirits developed into monsters who bewitch people, especially the youths, and then draw them down into the deep waters to put them to death. The Old-Slavonic friendly and

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

There will be no place to run and hide oneself; it will be woe and pain without comfort, particularly for the repenting sinners. They will see the anger of God, full of rage and wrath, bearing the woe of revenge.[55]

Also the folk religious poetry began to emphasize the gloomy aspects of *post-mortem* life, especially that of the *Strashny Sud*— The Terrible Judgment. It was perhaps in such conditions that Destiny, together with the Truth, became dissociated from the idea of a supreme Justice that reigned everywhere and came to be looked upon as being subject to the caprice of arbitrary and uncontrollable forces that now dominated the Universe.

Such circumstances might have meant quick disintegration of this society, not unlike the rapid dissolution of the Turco-Mongol empires, had it not been for agents that favored the stabilization and the perpetuation of this social system in spite of its internal weaknesses. One of the most important instruments in this process of social consolidation was the Byzantine Church.

5
THE BYZANTINE CHURCH AND MUSCOVITE MILITARY THEOCRACY

I

FOLLOWING the traditions established by the Roman Caesars, the Emperor of Byzantium (Basileus) was looked upon as the supreme war-lord, the sole legislator, and the chief justice, as well as the universal ruler. Therefore, the Church, which was subjected to the absolute and autocratic will of the Emperor, developed a religious ideology in accordance with the dominant political philosophy and practices of the Empire.

The Emperor assumed the duty of defending the Church, combating heresy, and spreading Orthodox faith throughout all the globe. In return, God had promised him universal dominion

1 [cf. cat. 116, pp. 52-55 -- Analyst]

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

another instrument at the disposal of the father in imposing
discipline on his son consisted of threat of disinheritance and 596
banishment. If an unmarried son left the paternal house during 428
the lifetime of his father to establish his own separate household, the father was not obliged to give him anything and might even let him go "with nothing but his cross" (*s odnim krestom*).[8] But if a married son left with his father's consent, it was the privilege of the father to determine what his share should be.[9] Also in his testamentary disposition, the father was entitled to dispose of family property at will. The father also had the right to disinherit his son and chase him away from home as a punishment for bad behavior, especially disobedience.[10] He also had the power to select the disobedient son for military conscription. According to some sources the father had the right to sell his son "four times."[11] He might show predilection in testamentary disposition.[12] Many tales tell of a father's favoritism toward an obedient son.[13]

But the way the father used most often to impose his will and 593
assert his power was coercion (*prinuzhdenie*) by means of phys- 861
ical beating (*poboi*). The horse whip and the birch rod (*rozga*) were used freely in family relations. The *Domostroy*, a code of Great-Russian family practices and ethics of the urban strata compiled and edited in the sixteenth century by Priest Sylvester, a councillor and confessor of Ivan the Terrible, prescribes in detail the application of corporal punishment as a sanction of the father's authority and rule:

> Beat your son in his youth, and he will comfort you in your old age . . . And do not weaken in beating the child. Beating with a rod will not kill him, but will make him healthier . . . If you will be weak in his childhood, he will make you suffer when he grows up . . . And give him no power in youth but crush his ribs while he is growing, because when he is big he will not obey you, and you will feel annoyed and ill at heart, and your house will be ruined . . . and your enemies will rejoice at your misfortune.[14]

The popular philosophy of life as expressed in the Great- 538?
Russian folk proverbs approves of the teachings of the Domostroy. "If God gives you sons, don't be lazy, teach them and beat them"; "If he did not obey his father, he will obey the whip,"

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

II

[582] Perhaps as a result of family centeredness and the need of 606 keeping a distance from one's neighbor, there developed the practice of looking for the bride not in one's own but in another, more remote locality. Brides from afar, who did not have an opportunity to keep frequent contact with their own parents, were considered not only more amenable to control and easier to assimilate, but less dangerous from the point of view of the family's collective responsibility and isolation. "Do not buy a horse nor marry a daughter of your neighbor: both will run away"; "Get a wife from afar, buy a cow from near," the people would say.

[584] Very often there was nothing for a girl to look forward to in her new family. Her mate was not of her choice; he and his family were often complete strangers to her. She might not have even seen any of them before the day of her marriage. Wedding songs always refer to the bridegroom, his home, his father, and his village as "the abode of the strangers," "the unknown, far off land." As soon as the father had "stuck the hands" with the match-maker, the bride-to-be would start to lament and implore her father not to "give her away to the strangers." On the eve of the bride's marriage, her girl friends would come to her home and spend all evening singing *piesni plachevia*—"weeping songs,"[10] while the bride would cry and wail continuously. In these songs the future bride imagines herself as being left completely alone and without any affection in a distant, unknown and unfriendly world.[11]

[538] The anxieties and fears felt by the bride when going away to marry a stranger in a "strange land" might have found, perhaps, a symbolic expression in the *Zmey* tales. Zmey is a mythical being whose function is to deceive and rape young maidens and keep them forever in captivity. In the Great-Russian folk tales the Zmey is pictured as a terrifying "winged" and "many-headed" monster which throws fire from his nostrils and his mouth, but assumes the form of a youth of marvelous beauty before he abducts his victim.[12]

The prospect of the bride's relations with her husband's

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RFI Great Russia RFI

parents and brothers, and with her sisters-in-law was not any brighter. In folk sayings the father-in-law is often referred to as "worse than a dog," and the mother-in-law as a "wicked satan." Her expectations about the treatment on the part of other in-laws were not more cheerful, as witnessed by the folk songs.[13]

When married, she soon realized that "before the husband the wife is always guilty" (*Pered muzhem zhena vsegda vinovata*). And there was no one to whom to complain or from whom to seek comfort. Her own parents and brothers were "far away" or indifferent to her fate, now that she was "cut off from the loaf" and belonged to another family. And if she did not develop an attachment to her husband or to her children, she might have sought an escape from such a difficult emotional situation in extra-marital love affairs, or in fantasies about such affairs. The Great-Russian folk songs are abundant with such themes and often justify these liaisons as a need for love and attachment which was denied to the bride in the home of the husband.[14] Extreme husband-wife antagonism as expressed by murder is occasionally the theme of Great-Russian religious sagas and more frequently the theme of folk tales[15] and of folk songs:

Against my will was I married;
I have taken an evil wife,
An evil one, not to my liking,
Neither in feeling nor in thought.
Lovingly live with her—that will I not.
Across the stream will I go,
Love will I make to the girls.
As for that wife of mine
I will go pray for her death.
Along the bank of the stream
Death, the beautiful, goes.
"Ho there! My beautiful Death!
Turn thee back again, Death!
Make an end of my wife."
Scarce had I spoken—when Death
Began her work with my wife.
Scarce had I time to look around—
Shrouded in linen white was her corpse
Struck was the stroke on the bell.[16]

6; Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RFI Great Russia RFI

desire for his father's death.[17] Only then was there hope for freedom. A folk maxim, for instance, says: "When the earth takes the parents, the children get their freedom." Such an extreme form of revolt, however, was not so simple because it went counter to the accepted image of the father, his supernaturally sanctioned absolute power, his care and solicitude for the welfare of all the family, and the traditional obligation of love and gratitude towards him on the part of the family members. Hence antagonistic attitudes against the father were regularly mixed with strong feelings of guilt.

Both the feeling of guilt and the fear of being rejected by the father might have perhaps been manifested in those folk tales which tell gruesome and frightful stories about children who were abandoned by their parents[18] and left at the mercy of wild beasts, frost, open sea, and in those folk tales in which the children are dismembered by their own parents and thrown away in small pieces. That the father himself sensed a potential feeling of rebelliousness on the part of his son and that he himself might have had a feeling of guilt because of his treatment of his son is witnessed by folk sayings which express a dread of old age with its dependency upon one's own children: "To pay old debts and to feed old parents are the hardest things in the world"; "One father will feed nine children sooner than nine children will feed one father"; "God take away my life rather than let me be under my son's care."[19]

There were other tensions and conflicting situations in the Great-Russian patriarchal family, particularly in the urban strata. The principle of seniority, for instance, reserved disciplinary privileges and responsibilities for the brothers in relation to their sisters, and for the senior brothers and sisters in relation to their juniors. At the same time a father's absolute power often took the form of favoritism in respect to a younger son, or to a daughter, which was counter to the established principles of seniority and therefore considered unjust. There was therefore plenty of opportunity for resentments, rivalries, jealousies, hatreds, and fights among the siblings, or between the older and the younger family members:

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

ment of moderation and emotional integration. In the early Slav society, mother's role in all family affairs was very significant. With the growth of the patriarchal family, one of her important duties came to be that of intercessor and of protector against the wrath of the father. In the patriarchal family the mother was not the chief disciplinarian; therefore she did not have to resort to threat, violence, privations, and humiliation as a means of discipline. Her punishments were mild and her main means of control were those of love and reasoning. Her authority and self-respect were therefore not endangered by being close to children and by being on familiar terms with them. She was always available and approachable. The children, therefore, felt much more at ease and free in the presence of their mother than in that of their father.[1]

The mother, if feeling neglected, abused or degraded by a remote and harsh husband, was likely to seek compensation for the lack of love and for wounded self-esteem by being over-protective and over-affectionate in relation to her children, expecting indulgent response from them. The son, if barred in his desire for attachment to his father or if abused and humiliated by him, might feel the more attracted to his mother as a means of emotional outlet and as compensation for feelings of rejection and humiliation.

It is this role of the mother as warm protector and close friend that has been expressed in folk sayings and other products of folk philosophy and imagination. "Fear your father, and respect your mother" says a Russian folk proverb pointing out the sharp contrast in the attitude of a child toward his father and his mother. The folk sayings emphasize also the intimate and tender bond that exists between mother and child and the importance of such close ties for the child. "Without a father the child is half orphan, without a mother a child is a complete orphan"; "Mother's beating does not hurt"; "Mother raises her hand high, but does not strike hard." Because of such close mother-child relationship, it was considered in the popular view of life that mother's influence on the child was in the long run deeper than that of the father. "What mother puts into the child's head, the father will not knock out," the people would say.

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

593 538 The Great-Russian epic legends have the same image of the mother. One of the most peculiar and significant aspects of these narratives is that in times of distress, in moments of gloom or when gripped by strong feelings of guilt it is often the mother who comes to the rescue of the *bogatyr* (legendary hero), gives him solace, helps him with advice, places her treasure at his disposal.[2] The mother is considered to be of such a great value that heroes, in the course of their feasting and drinking bouts, when boasting of their war exploits, of their horses and possessions, boast also of their mothers:

> One boasts of his good steed,
> One boasts his silken breeches,
> One boasts his villages with hamlets,
> One boasts his towns with their suburbs,
> One boasts of his dear mother,
> But the foolish one boasts of his young wife.[3]

593 771 Mother's role as a moderator *vis-à-vis* a harsh and detached father was expressed very early in the Russian religious lore. For instance, one of the most popular religious tales of early Russia was the one of the "journey of the Mother of God through the Inferno." In this story the *Bogoroditsa* (Birth-giver to God), impressed by the tortures of sinners, implored God to pardon them. At first God was implacable, but finally, as a result of Bogoroditsa's supplication, he promised some relief in their suffering.[4] In the same manner the contemporary Russian religious folk poetry often pictures the Mother of God as the "fastest helper" and as the "warm interceder":

> Mother mine—Mother Maria,
> Purest maiden—The Most Holy
> Mother of the World—Maria,
> Most holy Birthgiver to God,
> Beautiful sun,
> Purest dove,
> Mother of God,
> The fastest helper,
> The warm interceder
> Intercede, save and have mercy.[5]

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

771 776 now my feelings have not changed) a feeling of wonder but at the same time also of fear. He created Heaven and earth. He too created me—and still even though I bow before Him, there is no love."[10] Michael Bakunin only elaborated on this basic popular concept of the Russian Orthodox God when he pictured the Lord as "God of vengeance and rage" who delights in eternal torturing of human beings and who is so "bloodthirsty and cruel" that he decided that his own son should be tortured and put to death by means of crucifixion.[11] A similar image of a self-seeking, dominating, arbitrary, and cruel God is found also in some Russian religious folk poems: [538]

> Your gifts are not dear to me
> But dear to me are your souls.
> And I will be God above Gods,
> I will be Tzar above Tzars.
> And I will pick the apostles myself,
> And I will give them my mark,
> And I will give them my baptism.
> I will send them in all countries
> Who will receive them, will save himself
> And who does not, he will be tortured.[12]

Before such a God, like before the omnipotent earthly powers, there is nothing one can do but resign himself to his fate and await for God's decision at his *Strashny Sud* (Terrible Judgment). Thus when Fletcher asked a Russian Orthodox Bishop if he knew he was going to be saved the answer was that ". . . he knew not whether he should bee saved or no: but if God would *poshallovat* (take compassion on) him, or gratifie him so much as to save him, so it was, hee would be glad of it; if not what remedie?"[13] Such an image of an omnipotent, fierce and arbitrary God, the same as that of an all-powerful and harsh Father or Czar, might inspire humility, blind obedience and unconditional submissiveness; it might provoke also strong feelings of guilt, and a need for repentance and expiation of one's sins. Thus, next to fear, Russian religion emphasizes meekness and asceticism as a means of survival in the face of all-mighty and arbitrary powers.[14]

In this manner popular religious ideas and practices which

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

12
IDENTIFICATION WITH SUFFERING AND DEMAND FOR ACCEPTANCE

I

WANT of affection and self-pity experienced by a rejected child could be generalized. Identification with a humiliated and suffering mother might foster or reinforce the same tendencies. As a result sympathy is extended to others who suffer and desire might be expressed or action may be taken to alter conditions which cause all human misery. These ideas and attitudes are then strengthened by those patterns of family relationships which stress responsibility of one for well-being and salvation of all and which favor group orientation and social solidarity.

Such family experiences might affect the whole life careers of some people. If these happen to be intellectual and political leaders, their emotional responses could have a significant influence on the course of the intellectual and political history of their countries. Thus, in Russia feelings of rejection and identification with those who suffer gave a strong emotional support to ideologies which sought a Messianic salvation of all suffering humanity.

A number of outstanding literary figures of Russia in the middle of the nineteenth century, such as Herzen, Belinsky, and Nekrasov, demonstrated in their writings a strong aversion for the existing social system in Russia, expressed irreverence for the old values, showed love of new and challenging ideas, and exhibited a remarkable fighting spirit of revolutionary character. At the same time, they all tended to idealize the Russian people, professed great love, enthusiasm and admiration for the common folk and felt a great compassion for the poor and the suffering everywhere. They believed that the main purpose of literature

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

[Belinsky]
[Nekrasov]
[Herzen]

538 517 was to convey to the masses a social message. In their literary essays they stressed the social and political ills of Russia and believed in the Westernization of their country as a way out of its social and political difficulties.

[593] 159 [157] It is reported that Belinsky grew up with the feeling of revolt against the despotism of his father who tyrannized the family. Nekrasov, "at the age of 17 . . . broke with his father whom he detested even as he idolized his mother" . . . And it was Nekrasov who in his writings showed an especially "great and unfeigned compassion for the poor and the suffering" and who "idealized and worshipped the Russian people,"[1] that is, the people who have been exposed to an age long misery. In a similar manner Herzen had generalized his childhood experiences and had transferred his reactions to all human kind. As a child he showed a strong reaction against his "inaccessible" father and a deep sympathy for all those whom his father abused:

> . . . the hushed voices and noiseless steps of the servants were no sign of devotion, but of repression and fear. All impulsiveness and frankness my father disliked and called familiarity; and all display of feeling passed with him for sentimentality. And when this proud old man, with his clear understanding and sincere contempt of mankind, played this part of a passionless judge, whom did he mean to impress by the performance: A woman whose will he had broken, though she never tried to oppose him; a boy whom his own treatment drove from mere naughtiness to positive disobedience; and a score of footmen whom he did not reckon as human beings! . . . Always on his guard, discontented with everyone, he suffered when he saw the feelings he inspired in every member of the household. Smiles died away and talk stopped whenever he came into the room. Stinging mockery and cool contemptuous irony were the weapons which he could wield with the skill of an artist, and he used them equally against us and against the servants. There are few things that a growing boy resents more; and, in fact, up to the time of my imprisonment I was on bad terms with my father and carried on a petty warfare against him, with the men and maids for my allies . . . did I deserve that he should preach even the truth in a manner so repulsive to the heart of youth? His intelligence, chilled by a long life spent in a corrupt society, made him suspicious of all the world; his feelings were not warm and did not crave for reconciliation; and therefore he remained at enmity

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

[Catherine Breshkovskaya]
[Bakunin]

154 159 668 How many times, stupefied and shocked, I have been the witness of such humiliating, degrading, excruciating things! How many times I have thrown myself at my father's feet to implore pardon for a so-called culprit, whose only fault, perhaps, was to have fallen asleep while herding the sheep! How many times I have been indignant to see how hundreds of peasants would be kept waiting in the courtyard, bare-headed and shivering with cold, waiting for the master to appear, after making them wait all day, would send them off without a word, so taken up was he with gambling at cards with other lords, who in their turn were making their coachmen wait on the carriage box till their hands were frozen! These things tormented my childish mind, and pursued me even into my bed, where I would lie awake for hours, unable to sleep for thinking of all the horrors about me. Child as I was, I could not understand why these honest folk should bear the entire burden of work and of taxes. I saw that my father, good though he was, put much more heart into looking after his own interests than the interests of his serfs, and I was shocked at the inequality between the rich and the poor. From the age of eight, how to find justice was the question that troubled me.[5]

538 771 Identification with suffering is outstanding in the literary works of Dostoyevsky. Influenced by religious feelings, he considered his own sufferings as a blessing. He identified Russia with crucified Christ and regarded the sufferings of the Russian people as a means by which the wrongs of all mankind will be expiated so that a new and better order will prevail on the earth: "All men will be holy and love one another, and there will be no more rich nor poor, no exulted nor humbled, but all will be as the children of God, and the true Kingdom of Christ will come."[6]

II

593 159 668 Not in all families of Russian intelligentsia was the situation alike. There were families in which harmonious relations prevailed. There were also families in which reaction developed not against the despotism of the father but against the tyranny of the mother. Bakunin, for instance, describes his mother as "a vain, egotistical woman and none of her children loved her."[7] According to Carr, Bakunin "attributed his passion for destruction to the influence of his mother, whose despotic character

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

[Bakunin]

[Saint Theodosius]

593 159 [668]

inspired him with an insensate hatred of every restriction on liberty."[8]

Identifying himself with all the oppressed, this leading Russian anarchist revolted not only against the family and the state, but against God as well, because God was a symbol of authority and fear. To Bakunin the concept of a God of fear implied abdication of reason and of justice, and was the negation of human liberty. He expounded therefore the overthrow of God as a necessary precondition of human liberation.[9] To Bakunin the revolt of Satan against God was the first attempt of free thought, of science, and of human freedom.[10]

Not unlike this was the reaction of Turgeniev toward the despotism of his mother. This outstanding Russian novelist apparently developed a great compassion for the Russian serfs and became a champion in the struggle for freedom and for the emancipation of the peasants because he identified his own sufferings with the plight of the muzhiks on the estate of his mother. Turgeniev's mother apparently gave vent both on her son and on her serfs for the sufferings of her unhappy married life, and in bringing up her own son she made few concessions. The same excessive strictness that she applied against serfs she exercised also against her own son. "I was flogged almost every day for merest trifles," says Turgeniev.[11] [538]

An earlier case of reaction against a despotic mother and resulting identification with those who are humiliated is that of Saint Theodosius. This Russian saint was one of the founders of Russian monasticism in the eleventh century. According to Fedotov, the main theme in the hagiography of Theodosius is the "strife with his mother . . . the cruel treatment he endured, and his threefold escape. Many scenes are painted with truly artistic skill, particularly the portrait sketched of the mother, with her passionate transitions from outbursts of anger to caresses, with her appearance as a virago: 'She was strong in body, vigorous as a man: anybody who would not have seen her but only heard her voice would believe it was that of a man.' "[12] 593 159 792

Theodosius reacted to the despotism of his mother by wearing "uncouth and patched garb" like the poor and the beggars to the dismay of his parents, who were well-to-do people and felt hor-

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

[Saint Theodosius]

593 rified by such behavior. After his father's death, Theodosius used
159 "to go to the fields with the slaves and work humbly."[13] Later
792 when Theodosius finally escaped from his mother's tyranny by entering a monastery, he became the founder of that school of Russian monastic philosophy which emphasizes self-abnegation and meekness, as well as charitable love and compassion for those who suffer. In that manner Theodosius identified himself and his Church with all those who were tyrannized. But he was also active in protecting those to whom injustice was done. He became "intercessor for many before judges and princes, rescuing people."[14]

152 Deep sympathy for those who suffer and identification with
695 them might explain why the Russian juries and the peasant courts were so ready to acquit the repentants. Juries and courts would often set free criminals who were found guilty by well established evidence. The verdict in such a case might be "not guilty" because of "commiseration for the poor murderer." A jury sitting through Holy Week would tend to acquit everybody, because "at the time of our Lord's Passion, it does not become Christians to condemn their brethren."[15]

152 Sympathy for those who suffer and identification with them
● 538 is an outstanding trait of Russian literature of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Russian writings of those days exhibit a preoccupation with great social, political, religious and psychological problems of mankind. They picture a gloomy, painful, and tragic world, full of misery, injustice, blood and death. In the same manner the school textbooks of those days contained many heartbreaking stories full of compassion and commiseration for the suffering, unprotected, weak.

152 When identification with suffering is a manifestation of revolt
783 or is combined with the urge for revolt, strong feelings of guilt
538 might develop. On such grounds compulsion to suffer and to be
668 persecuted might thrive. This "Russian Kenotism" is found among the early Russian monastics[16] as well as among the Russian nineteenth century revolutionaries and men of letters. Some Russian revolutionary factions, for instance, emphasized sacrifice and martyrdom to the point of self-destruction.[17] In the like manner Count Leo Tolstoy claims in his diary that he, "often

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RFl Great Russia RFl

wanted to suffer, wanted persecution."[18] A number of heroes in Dostoyevsky's novels show the same urge.

Undoubtedly such feelings contributed to that tone of fanaticism and that readiness for self-sacrifice which was characteristic of many Russian revolutionaries and conspirators of pre-Soviet days and which gave a special vigor and intensity to their activities. Such extremes in emotional reactions were supported also by another trait in these people, that of emotional instability.

13
EMOTIONAL INSTABILITY

I

FEAR and awe (*strakh*), submission (*povinovenie*), and sense of guilt (*sovest*) are rooted in the structure of the Great-Russian society and are supported by its traditions. But so is compassion (*zhalost*), humility (*smirenie*), demand for truth and justice (*pravda*) and for egalitarian acceptance, as well as revolt and terror (*ustrashenie*), lack of trust and urge to destroy (*unichtozhenie*). It is the propensity to experience such contrasting sentiments that causes behavior which is alternatively bent in opposite directions. A person's behavior which has been conditioned by an environment which fosters such feelings and attitudes might show a lack of sense of moderation and a tendency toward extremes in responses to his social milieu.

It is such unbalanced peculiarities of behavior that have drawn the attention of many students and observers of Russian society.[1] A tendency toward diametrically opposite extremes, and frequent alternation between these poles has been often noticed. Kindliness and gentleness have alternated with lack of consideration, excessive severity, brutality and cruelty. Rebelliousness has been followed by resignation. Periods of feverish energy and confidence have been superseded by spells of inertia, languor and despair. Extremes in feasting have alternated with extremes in fasting. Tyrannical rule had its counterpart in demands for

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

Top ruling circles themselves often exhibited a great lack of self-control. A number of rulers showed a tendency toward excesses and extremes that bordered on insanity. Even the Czars of the nineteenth century, in spite of many Western moderating influences, showed tendencies toward instability and extremes in their behavior. Not seldom a new monarch would completely reverse the policies of his predecessor. The rulers tended to show great instability also in attitudes toward their advisers. They would turn suddenly against the old councilors and find new favorites. As a result often "the mighty of yesterday were sent to Siberia or the scaffold." But also barrack and bedchamber revolutions were frequent, reflecting the suddenly changing extremes in moods within the ruling cliques.

Lack of moderation and emotional instability was one of the favored themes of Russian belles-lettres of the nineteenth century. The heroes in these works often display an extremely unbalanced type of behavior. Feodor Chaliapin, who himself took part in producing such types on the Russian stage, states the following:

> . . . When I think of the characters I have created on the Russian stage, I am conscious not so much of the characters themselves as of an all pervading sense of the Russian temperament that is all extremes. . . . It seems as though Russian temperament is entirely devoid of moderation. . . . The fact remains that their contradictions are far more harsh and violent than those of most mentalities. . . . The Russian heart is infinitely pitiful and tender, but at the same time what gross and often completely aimless cruelty and tyranny are to be found in Russian life. The Russian soul is extraodinarily sensitized, but what brutality and lustful suspicion and vulgarism are to be found in human relationships. It is only too true that neither in good nor in evil can the Russian steer a middle course . . .[8]

In *Khovantchina* it is religious fanaticism, and how profound and powerful is that fanaticism! A normal mind could not possibly comprehend that perfect serenity which enables men to die for their belief. They stand on the sheer rampart, utterly oblivious of the stairway by which they might descend to safety. They batter their heads against the wall, unconscious of pain . . . In Rimsky-Korsakov's *Pskovitane* I take the part of Ivan the Terrible. He, the Tsar, cares nothing that the river runs red with blood, so illimitable is his knowledge of

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

his power over others, so unshakable is his belief in his own sovereignty. . . . There is tremendous strength in *Boris Godunov*, the part I would sooner play than any of the others of my repertory. Here again the Russian temperament is overwhelmingly manifest in the seditious license of the boyars, as it is in the boundless autocracy of Ivan the Terrible. It appears also in the lawlessness and drunkenness of Prince Galitski, one of the chief characters of Borodin's admirable opera *Prince Igor*. Galitski's excesses are as extreme as his cynicism.[9]

Some observers of Great-Russian music find in it traits similar to those of Great-Russian belles-lettres. According to Leroy-Beaulieu the Great-Russian music shows an "alternation between extreme emotionality and extreme peacefulness."[10] And according to General Golovine this music is a "combination of the vague and salient softness and harshness of sound, deep sorrow and uncontrolled gaiety, dreams and drama, restlessness and calm . . ."[11] Golovine specifically referred to the music of Glinka, Chaikovsky, Borodin, Rimsky-Korsakoff, and Rachmaninoff.

Extremes of self-aggrandizement followed by self-maceration, murder followed by tears, is noticeable also in the Russian folk psychology. The Great-Russian folk songs, for instance, are often full of cruelty, but are also heart-breaking and plaintive, full of sadness, melancholy and tragedy, sung in minor key. In folk tales and folk songs about Stenka Razin, this robber-bandit is represented both as magnanimous and cruel, as savage and pitiful. He revolted against those in authority, but rallied the poor and rebellious beneath his banner. At the same time he himself showed traits of barbarism and of self-laceration. One of the popular Russian folk songs, tells us, for instance, how once Stenka, "drunk with wine and mirth together," lifted the Persian Princess, his beloved "new-vow bride," over the side of his barque and flung her "forth into the hungry deep" of the Volga, as "a gift from a Cossack of the Don." Stenka acted in such a violent manner because some of his comrades had scornfully reproached him that in his affection to his bride he behaved like a *baba* (woman).

II

A number of interpretations are offered for such behavior.[12] Most of these explanations are either "geografic" or "cultural-

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

Thwarted in their drive for power and political leadership, these young men and women gave vent to their feelings of deprivation in phantasies and plans of destruction and death.

Much of the sadness, tragic sarcasm, morbidity and preoccupation with death and suffering which dominated Russian literature in the second part of the nineteenth century reflects such moods of despair. The predominance of social and political themes in the literary creations of these people and the insistence of literary critics of those days on literary "realism," that is, that a work of art should be judged not by artistic and esthetic criteria but by its portrayal of existing life and its faithfulness to reality, especially the brutal and dark reality, manifested the same feelings.

Pisarev, describing this psychological reaction of impotence and the urge for destruction before seemingly uncontrollable forces, stated that when men "find it impossible to transform life, their anger at their own impotence makes itself felt in the sphere of thought, where the destructive work of criticism proceeds unceasingly."[6] That the basic drive behind this urge for negation and destruction was extreme self-seeking is witnessed by some other ideas of the same writer. "Every living being," said Pisarev, "is for himself the center and the meaning of the universe . . . his personal joys, vexations, aspirations, and cares, are more important than universal revolutions. . . ."

Starting with such premises, some of the Nihilists refused to recognize any regulation, any moral law, any principle, whether above, external, or within a person as being "absolute." The result was preaching of extreme materialism and individualism, and denial of all "absolute" ethics, of duty and of responsibility, of ideals and of social values.

II

In the meantime, however, the effects of European revolutions of 1848 and the defeats of the Russian armies in the Crimean War (1854–1856) led some of the Russian revolutionary intelligentsia to the belief that the Czarist system was not as invulnerable as generally accepted. These people proposed direct and organized action against the Czarist regime in order to raze it to

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

peasants. Such a situation in many cases bred extreme antagonism against the priests, especially when hostility against the priests was stirred up by systematic agitation, as in the case of various sects of Dissenters (*Raskolniki*). This agitation often took the form of folk songs:

hairy ones . . . the beasts:
These beasts are the priests
They howl, like wolves. . . .

• • •

In the churches they praise the Lord hypocritically,
And ensnare innocent people with their words;
In the churches they offer glory to God,
And send the Uryadniks to hunt innocent people;

• • •

And they drive innocent people to Siberia.
In the churches they open their mouths,
But before the government they keep silent.
Their hair is long like women's,
But their brain is a great deal shorter.

• • •

They howl like beasts;

• • •

They extort from all.
Wicked hairy priests . . .[2]

• • •

The peasants were attracted to numerous sects of the Dissenters which were spreading in Russia, especially since the seventeenth century when the great movement of the Old Believers (*Starovery*) began. In these sects and their ideologies the peasants protested against the conditions of serfdom. The teachings of a number of these sects expressed yearning for a new life, and for an anarchic brotherhood of men in which nobody would be rejected and everybody accepted on equal terms. Peasant Sutayev, for instance, who founded the Sutayevtsy sect in 1880, was considered to be one of the most pious churchgoers before he revolted against the official Church. He rebelled when he was over fifty. The occasion was a dispute that he had with his parish priest over a fee for the burial of his grandson. It was after this quarrel that he stopped going to

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

church claiming that " . . . one is not better for going there . . . because everything there has to be paid for. Besides, I have the Church within myself."[3]

Sutayev then started a religious crusade aiming at "a new life, the organization of a Christian life." He preached that "the nobles and the rich must give back the land to those to whom it of right belongs." He disapproved of commerce, of money, of private property, of violence, and of any form of coercion. He claimed that if commerce, money and violence were eliminated, then the courts and the tax collectors would disappear too. The tax collectors and all the functionaries who live on the people will not be necessary any more, he said. The army and the war will be suppressed since "all men are brothers." "The Kingdom of God must be brought here on the earth," he asserted.[4] Similar protest against the existing conditions of serfdom and rejection, and demand for an all-human equalitarian brotherhood were expressed in many songs of the Dissenters:

All kinds of ignorance,
Moral wretchedness,
Falsehood and inconsistency,
Baseness, hypocrisy,
Coarse superstition,
Are contrary to Christianity!
Slavery, oppression,
Violence, constraint,
Every sort of pressure against people—
All this—
Is abomination before God,
Transgression of his commandments.
All people on earth
Are the children of one mother,
And above God there is no power.
And all without regard to standing in society,
Should be equal
And free in their conscience.
Everyone can pray,
According to what seems to him,
To be his obligation in relation to God.

S: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

[538]
795
771

* * *

Why then in deeds of faith
Measures of compulsion
And all kinds of constraint?

* * *

Why then is this?[5]

795
641

Protest against the existing conditions of abusive dominance and subservient submission and longing for acceptance on terms of anarchic equality seems to have been the driving power behind the ideologies of a number of Great-Russian religious sects, such as the *Dukhobortsy* (the spirit-wrestlers), and the *Molokane* (the milk-drinkers). Not unlike the Nihilists and the Anarchists (whose reaction was also rooted in feelings of rejection), all these sects showed a strong resentment against abusive and distant authorities. At first the religious dissenters attacked the Church authorities but then this anti-authority attitude was generalized and extended to all the authorities, including the family, the landlords, the state and the Czar.

As a result all the authorities were blamed for the existing social ills and their removal was considered necessary in order to achieve a better life. There was no need for official clergy, courts, churches, sacraments, fasts, confession, communion, or any Church rituals except simple hymn singing, these sects said. There was no need for the Czar either, they claimed. Anything that smacked of authority and power was rejected. "We behold what a spirit of impiety works and shall work to the end of the world in all holders of power," they stated.[6] In 1868, a sect decreed that anyone who prays for the existing authorities shall be excommunicated. Now all the authorities, not just the priests, were identified with the beasts! "How will you ever find grace at the hands of the Beast?" A number of these sects identified the Czar with the Anti-Christ.

795
796

In their reaction against the suppression of the individual in the interest of those who hold power and in their strongly felt need for acceptance on terms of complete equality, the Dukhobortsy—not unlike the Nihilists—proclaimed the supremacy and the sanctity of the individual. Their demand for an anarchic acceptance was manifested in the emphasis of the

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

in the political philosophy expressed in Soviet writings and in the speeches of outstanding Party members, extreme hatred of the internal and external adversaries is considered as a precondition of Bolshevik victory and of survival of Soviet society. Thus, for instance, in a May Day Order of the Day, Stalin, as People's Commissar of Defense declared: "You cannot defeat any enemy without having learned to hate him with all the power of your soul." In Soviet writings Lenin is hailed as a man who had "a holy hatred of the oppressors of the people . . . "[12]

Just like the Anarchists before them, the Bolsheviks claim that a deliberate cult of hatred is a precondition for the development of a "revolutionary passion." They justify hatred as a means to achieve their revolutionary goals. Following the same traditions the Bolsheviks insist that fanatical devotion should be instilled in people as a means to arouse passionate hatred. Therefore deliberate cultivation of hate together with the training in extreme identification with the Leader, the Party, the Motherland, and the Communist cause must start with kindergarten and with school training of Soviet children. Passionate hatred and passionate love are expected to mutually strengthen each other. According to pedagogical teachings, the Soviet children should be "saturated with irreconcilable hatred toward the enemies of socialist society," as well as with "passionate love of the Motherland." But here too just as in the Anarchist precepts, hatred appears to take the first place and love the second:

> Hatred gives birth to class revolutionary vigilance and creates a feeling of irreconcilability toward the class enemy; the weakening of such vigilance undermines the cause of the socialist revolution. It is necessary to learn, not only to hate the enemy, but also to struggle with him, in time to unmask him and finally, if he does not surrender, to destroy him . . . to vanquish the enemy is impossible without the most burning hatred of him . . . Passionate love of the motherlands breeds inevitably strong hatred of the enemy.[13]

Many outstanding Soviet novelists in their writings emphasize this cult of destructive aggression. Maxim Gorki, for instance, wrote an essay entitled "If the enemy does not surrender, he must be destroyed." Konstantin Simonov, another outstanding Soviet

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

author, wrote a well known poem under the title *"Ubey ego"*—kill him.[14] In a similar manner Alexey Tolstoy, a well-known Soviet novelist, has published an essay entitled *Ubey Zverya*—Kill the Beast. "Kill him," writes Alexey Tolstoy, "that is your sacred command."[15] Mikhail Sholokhov, another prominent Soviet writer, wrote a pamphlet entitled *Nauka Nenavisti*—The Science of Hatred—in which he stressed, in a like way as the early Russian Anarchists and contemporary Soviet pedagogists, the necessity of ardent love for the Cause as a source of passionate hatred of all the opponents. To him, too, love seems to be necessary primarily as a means of hate.[16] "Hatred for enemies of the land of socialism is an inseparable feature of socialist ideology and the ideology of Leninism," the Bolsheviks repeatedly say.

Under the label "enemies" are classed not only the foreign "capitalists, imperialists, and reactionaries," and internal non-Party oppositionists, but also Party members who deviate from Party ideology, and "all sceptics, opportunists, capitulators, scabs, and traitors." Hatred and struggle against these "enemies" within the Party must be as merciless and ruthless as against external adversaries. This is considered to be imperative in a mortal struggle against the capitalist world:

> The history of the Party . . . teaches us that unless the Party of the working class wages an uncompromising struggle against the opportunists within its own ranks, unless it smashes the capitulators in its own midst . . . it cannot perform its role of organizer and leader of the proletarian revolution . . . If, while it is carrying on a life and death fight against the bourgeoisie, there are capitulators and traitors on its own staff, within its own fortress, the working class will be caught between two fires, from the front and the rear. Clearly such a struggle can only end in defeat.[17]

This conscious fomenting of intense hostility and animosity against internal, as well as external "enemies" as a means of survival in a "mortal struggle" is manifested in the language of Bolshevism. The words "liquidation" and "purge" which are often synonomous with killing and extermination of opponents became outstanding in Soviet vocabulary. There is an increasing use of words which convey ideas of hatred and violence and stimulate such feelings and practices. In Bolshevik stereotyped termi-